of the specific complaints and allegations made about the program and why it will not work, will not save the USPS money, and will not increase its efficiency.

1. The Hartford Postmaster reported that overnight delivery of first class mail increased from 88% in FY74 to 93% in FY75. The union points out that this was before the implementation of PIP.

2. PIP may actually end up costing the USPS additional money in the following ways:

a. Salaries of PIP employees, $250,000.

b. Cost of moving 71 employees to night shift ($1400 night differential per person), $184,000.

c. Cost of moving clerks to Sunday with 25% premium pay, $136,000.

d. Retraining clerks for window jobs, $21,000.

e. Training employees for LSM, $48,000.

(The above figures were provided by representatives of the union.)

3. Large mailers in Hartford (Travelers, Aetna, G. Fox's) send their mail to the post office in the morning. This mail is not worked until the evening.

4. Over 50% of managed mail arrives in the post office between the hours of 7AM and 1PM. It is shipped to satellites in the morning, re-sent and re-worked in Hartford in the evening.

5. A mail sorter (referred to by employees as the "octopus") was purchased in June 1975. After a loss of money and after grievances were filed to show its inefficiencies, it was "quietly" removed and the losses suffered.

6. The overall morale of the employees in the Hartford Post Office is at an "all time low." The employees believe that increased efficiency is impossible as long as the workers are not consulted before drastic changes such as these are put into effect.

These are very serious charges and I would appreciate an immediate and detailed investigation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. COTTER,
Member of Congress.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1976.

Hon. WILLIAM R. COTTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COTTER: Thank you for your letters of January 14 and February 10, requesting an investigation with respect to observations made to you about the Productivity Improvement Program at Hartford.

A detailed investigation was made with reference to the points outlined in your letter. The findings have been compiled and are set forth in the attachment to this letter.

We have dealt in good faith with the National and Local unions on this matter. While the concern of union officials is understandable, the provisions of the National Collective Bargaining Agreement have been followed.

Grievances have been filed regarding the implementation of the Productivity Improvement Program in Hartford, and are being processed in accordance with the grievance-arbitration procedures of the National Agreements.

While there may be union disagreement over the Productivity Improvement Program, we must schedule manpower in keeping with mail processing needs and the overall interests of postal efficiency.

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN F. BAILAR.

RESPONSE TO COMPLAINTS AND ALLEGATIONS AS STATED IN REPRESENTATIVE COTTER'S LETTERS OF JANUARY 14 AND FEBRUARY 10, 1976

(NOTE.—Complaints and allegations italicized.)

1. *The Hartford Postmaster reported that overnight delivery of first-class mail increased from 88% in FY 1974 to 93% in FY 1975 before the implementation of PIP.*

The statement is true.

2. The figures provided to you by APWU Local 147 on the cost of implementing the PIP Program at Hartford are not factual.

A. *Salaries of PIP Employees.*

All PIP team members were Postal Service employees detailed from Headquarters, Region, District and local offices who were drawing their regular salaries. To utilize engineers from Headquarters, region and district offices on field assignments is a normal course of business and their salaries are paid from normal budgets. Local management personnel utilized were given temporary assignments on PIP teams by rescheduling vacations and by distributing the work among other management personnel. There is no basis for a $250,000 figure.

B. *Cost of Moving 71 Employees to Night Shift.*

Mail arrival patterns and the hourly percent flowing through mail processing operations were analyzed over a three week period. People were assigned to those hours where mail was available to be worked. The maximum estimated cost of night differential pay would be approximately $79,000 per year. On the basis of less hours worked annually per employee, the minimum cost would be approximately $53,500. By matching employee workhours with mail availability, we eliminate much overtime pay. There is no basis for the $184,000 figure.

C. *Cost of Moving Clerks to Sunday with 25% Premium Pay.*

Ninety-six employees will work Sunday hours for an annual cost of approximately $57,000. Additionally, by working regular employees on Sundays, we will eliminate 65 casuals (limited term workforce) for a savings of $194,000. This action will also considerably reduce Sunday overtime. There is no basis for the $136,000 figure.

D. *Retraining Clerks for Window Jobs.*

Forty bids are assigned to window and central mark-up. Training for employees will cost approximately $10,000. There is no basis for the $21,000 figure.

E. *Training Employees for Letter Sorting Machines.*

Thirty-five additional operators are required to man the letter sorting machines. The LSM training will create a significant savings and will cost approximately $18,500. There is no basis for the $48,000 figure.

3. *Estimates supplied by the union indicate that the PIP program may cost the USPS an* additional $639,000.

The PIP study has indicated a savings of $1.1 million in the Hartford office due to rescheduling and staffing with an expenditure of approximately $164,500 to achieve that savings.

4. *Large mailers in Hartford send their mail to the post office in the morning. This mail is not worked until the evening.*

Mail which comes in before 1:00 PM is insufficient in volume to warrant full staffing at that time. The bulk of the insurance mail is received three times per month (5th, 15th and 25th). This mail is scheduled to be worked as it arrives on those days.

5. Over 50% of managed mail arrives in the post office between the hours of 7:00 AM and 1:00 PM. It is shipped to satellites *in the morning, resent and reworked in Hartford in the evening.*

It is true that 50% of the managed mail does arrive between 7:00 AM and 1:00 PM. This mail is scheduled to be worked as it arrives. During 1975 mail was sent outside the Hartford Post Office for processing, once to Waterbury (June 7) and four times to New Britain to meet service standards.

6. *Mail sorter (octopus) was "quietly" removed and losses suffered after grievances were filed to show its inefficiencies.*

The above Mail Distribution Ring was purchased for the new building which will be occupied in August. A Regional Headquarters decision was made that the system would be given a trial in the present building. It was obvious from the start that there was not sufficient room for the system in the present building, and four union safety grievances, a management decision was made to remove the system to storage. The Distribution Ring System has had considerable success in several offices around the country. There is presently a distribution ring operating efficiently at the Murphy Road Annex. There will be adequate space at the new facility for this unit. The Distribution Ring will be operating in the new building.

7. *The morale of the employees is at an "all time low," and increased efficiency is impossible as long as workers are not consulted before drastic changes are put into effect.*

During regular Management-Union meetings held at the Postmaster's office, progress of the PIP team was given as a point of discussion.

8. Several planned meetings were held between the PIP Team Leader/Postmaster and local union representatives to discuss the up-to-date progress of the program. Specific meetings were:

May 1, 1975—Meeting was held to give a complete explanation of the PIP program (results of the study and procedure used to get the savings). The local president and vice-president walked out of the meeting, the regional union vice-president stayed for the complete meeting.

July 10, 1975 (10:00 AM)—Meeting was held with local APWU representatives to discuss minor adjustments which had been made in the scheduling and staffing plan.

August 8, 1975 (10:00 AM)—Meeting was held in Washington between Headquarters officials and APWU national officers and staff to discuss impact of Hartford study. APWU requested to examine the basic data in the Hartford study. Permission was granted.

December 3, 1975—Meeting was held at Hartford office between Headquarters, region, district and local postal officials and national APWU staff consultants and local representatives to discuss the Productivity Improvement Program. A complete overview and program update was given. APWU representatives requested and were given access to information concerning the following activities:

Productivity Rate—Operational Analysis A/P I through 4, 1975.

Mail Arrival Pattern—Test Data.

PIP Base Volumes—Oper. Analysis A/P 4 through A/P 6, 1975.

Current Surface and Air Transportation Schedules.

Management Operating Data Systems Handbook.

Present Schedule of Clerical Employees.

MPLSM—Performance Evaluation Report, A/P 6, week 3.

Present number of LSM operators, categor-

ized by tour, scheme and position, and number of employees in training.

List of Operations studied in PIP, and not studied in PIP.

Copy of Original Operation Detail Reports.

Copy of Current Operation Detail Reports.

Proposed Staffing and Scheduling Plan:

December 17, 1975—Meeting was held in Washington between Headquarters postal officials and the APWU national officials and consultants to discuss their analysis of the Hartford based data.

January 2, 1976—Meeting was scheduled at 9:00 AM with Hartford Post Office management and Local 147 representatives to discuss PIP implementation. Union representatives did not show up. Meeting was rescheduled for 1:30 PM, but again Union representatives did not appear. After repeated attempts to get representatives to accept bid package, it was sent via Certified Mail to the local Union office.

January 2, 1976—Letters were sent to homes of 71 employees who were being excessed from Tour 2.

January 5, 1976—Letters were sent to all remaining Tour 2 employees advising them of their status.

January 8, 1976—Meeting was held between the Postmaster, PIP Team and APWU representatives to discuss the status of Tour 2 employees.

January 10, 1976—The complete bid package was mailed to the homes of all bargaining unit employees.

January 12, 1976—The bid package was officially posted on all bulletin boards at the Main Post Office, stations and branches.

February 5, 1976—List of successful bidders was posted for Tour 2 positions. Approximately 45 successful bidders were placed in their new positions effective February 14, 1976.

9. *Security of jobs for veterans and disabled veterans.*

All changes in Hartford personnel will be handled in accordance with the National Collective Bargaining Agreement.

LEGISLATION TO CLARIFY TAX CODE PROVISION THAT COULD HARM MANY CHARITIES IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to clarify a provision in the Internal Revenue Code which, if the current IRS interpretation is permitted to stand, could prove extremely harmful to charitable organizations across the country.

I refer to the position taken by the IRS that liens securing assessments for offsite improvements are "acquisition indebtedness," thus making the charitable organizations holding the assessed property liable for taxes on the income produced from the property.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the intent of Congress in enacting section 514 of the code was to prevent tax-exempt organizations from, in effect, trading on their exempt status in transactions involving the sale or lease of property held for activities unrelated to the charitable function. Quite clearly, an assessment by a municipal or State government to defray the costs of offsite improvements such as curbs or sewers is not subject to the kind of manipulation toward which section 514 was rightly directed.

It is especially noteworthy that the IRS has concluded, in its applicable regulations, that real estate taxes are not "acquisition indebtedness" within the meaning of the code, unless the charitable organizations have defaulted in paying those taxes. Yet there is little substantive or procedural difference, for this purpose, between real estate taxes and assessments for local benefits. Some State and local governments use both devices to finance similar projects and, in pure economic terms, real estate taxes due in future years are just as concrete an obligation as assessments due in future years to cover the costs of local benefits.

The Bishop estate in Hawaii, which operates the entire system of Kamehameha Schools, is one of the entities that would suffer substantially if the IRS position is allowed to stand. Kamehameha Schools not only provides quality education to its own student body, but is also developing a number of exciting new programs for the Hawaii public school system. If the estate's income from numerous pieces of property is subjected to Federal income tax because of the IRS misinterpretation of section 514, it is the children of Hawaii who will suffer, for these innovative programs would surely be curtailed.

This is a matter which would involve minimal revenue loss to the Federal Government: its impact, however, on the charitable activities of thousands of organizations in Hawaii and across the country, would be substantial.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the bill I introduce today will receive favorable and timely attention by the Ways and Means Committee and the House as a whole. At this point I include the text of the bill:

H.R. 12052

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that indebtedness arising out of taxes or special assessments imposed by State or local governments will not be treated as acquisition indebtedness for purposes of the tax on unrelated business income

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (6) of section 514(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining acquisition indebtedness) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) CERTAIN FINANCING.—For purposes of this section, the term 'acquisition indebtedness' does not include—

"(A) an obligation to the extent that it is insured by the Federal Housing Administration, to finance the purchase, rehabilitation, or construction of housing for low- and moderate-income persons, or

"(B) any indebtedness to the extent that it arises out of a tax or special assessment imposed by a State or any political subdivision thereof."

(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

THE PEOPLE'S "NEED TO KNOW"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Privacy Act of 1974 to require that Federal agencies maintaining files on individuals or organizations who were subjected to illegal surveillance be informed of that fact and of the fact that they have certain rights under the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act. The bill also gives the subject the right to require that every copy of the file be destroyed.

In all of the furor in the past few weeks over "leaks" of classified information, we are losing sight of the fact that we have done virtually nothing to remedy the wrongs done to innocent victims by the intelligence agencies in the name of national security. The first step in affording a measure of justice to the people and organizations which were subjected to snooping and harassment is simply to advise them that the Government still maintains files about their perfectly legal activities. The next step is to allow them the option of having every trace of such files destroyed.

No one should have to guess whether he or she was the object of illegal, unconstitutional, or improper activity by the intelligence agencies. Many people may not even be aware of the fact that the Government opened their mail or tapped their phone or otherwise had them under surveillance for doing nothing more than exercising their constitutional rights. These people have the right to be informed, to obtain their files under the Freedom of Information Act, and, if necessary, to seek legal remedies. It is for these reasons that I offer this bill which I believe answers the people's "need to know." The requirement of notice and the right to destroy one's file would apply to the following programs or operations:

First. Central Intelligence Agency and Federal Bureau of Investigation mail openings: As a result of the work of various House and Senate committees, the public has become aware of the shocking program of mail openings carried on by the CIA and the FBI for 20 years with the conscious knowledge that they were acting illegally. According to testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the New York program alone involved the opening of over 200,000 individual letters. Although "watch lists" were supplied by the CHAOS program and by the FBI, mail openings were not confined to those on the lists. Many innocent people, including Members of Congress, were subjected to this indecent invasion of privacy under the guise of national security when they had neither committed nor were they suspected of committing any crime. Every person or organization subjected to a mail opening should be informed that there is a file or an index resulting from that event, and should be given the right to have every trace of this invasion of privacy removed from the public record.

Second. National Security Agency monitoring of international communications: According to the Rockefeller Com-

P-file H.R.2635 file

mission report, part of the CHALS program conducted by CIA included the monitoring of international communications of individuals and organizations. In hearings held by the House Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights which I am privileged to chair, information was developed that commercial cable companies had been cooperating with the FBI and the National Security Agency for over 30 years in monitoring cable and telex traffic. Subsequently, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence released a report on Operation Shamrock, the cover name given to this message-collection program, indicating that international cables were routinely turned over to NSA. The Shamrock report states that "telegrams to or from, or even montioning, U.S. citizens whose names appeared on the watch list in the late 1960's and early 1970's would have been sent to NSA analysts, and many would subsequently be disseminated to other agencies." Mr. Speaker, these people have a right to know that the Government read their private communications without court order, and my bill will require that they be so informed.

Third. Burglaries: Both the FBI and CIA have stated publicly that they engaged in illegal burglaries and it is clear that many of these were directed against domestic dissident organizations. The FBI conducted some 238 entries in connection with the investigation of 12 "domestic security targets" in just one program. The Rockefeller Commission report states that the CIA conducted at least 12 unauthorized entries. Surely, the victim of a burglary ought to be informed that it was the Government itself which engaged in this incredible behavior.

Fourth. Warrantless wiretaps: By now it is well known that the FBI conducted a large number of electronic surveillances where the object of the tap was not a foreign power or its agents. In fact, the objects of the "Kissinger taps" appear to be restricted to newsmen and former employees of the NSC. Mr. Speaker, as a spinoff of Watergate and its penumbra, we have learned of a substantial number of these taps, but how many more were there about which we know nothing? My bill would require that every sender and receiver of an intercepted communication conducted without warrant must be informed that there exists a file on him or her as a result of the surveillance. Perhaps more important, it would give the subject of the file the right to have the contents destroyed. Why, for example, should the Government continue to maintain the logs of private conversations conducted over a period of almost 2 years on the home telephone of someone like Morton Haperin? It is clear that it should not perpetuate such a grievous invasion of personal privacy by continuing to maintain the fruits of wrongful surveillances.

Fifth. Operation CHAOS: This CIA program, which began as a survey of the extent of any foreign connections with domestic dissident events, evolved into a massive collection of data on American citizens and organizations. The Rockefeller report concluded:

> The Operation became a repository for large quantities of information on the domestic activities of American citizens. . . . Much of the information was not directly related to the question of the existence of foreign connections with domestic dissidence.

Mr. Speaker, the Rockefeller report concludes that the files of the CHAOS project which have no foreign intelligence value should be destroyed at the conclusion of the current congressional investigations. I agree, but not before the subjects of the files are made aware that they exist.

Sixth. COINTELPRO: From 1956 to 1971, the FBI engaged in a "Counterintelligence program" targeted against five domestic groups, including "the new left, white hate groups, and black extremist organizations." The recent revelations about the harassment and invasion of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.'s, privacy was shocking to almost all Americans. Yet we do not know how many others were subjected to similar disruptive tactics which the FBI admits having engaged in. Some of these tactics include, dissemination of false or fictitious material about individuals or groups; use of informants to disrupt a group's activities; informing employers and credit bureaus of members' activities; establishing sham organizations for disruptive purposes; informing family or others of radical or immoral activity; and more. Once again, Mr. Speaker, there are people in America today who are not aware of the fact that the troubles which were visited upon them a few years ago was the work of the FBI. Is it not our duty to so inform them?

Seventh. Internal Revenue Service special service staff. In 1969, the IRS created this unit focused on "ideological, militant, subversive, radical, and similar type organizations." By 1973 there was a total of 11,458 SSS files on 8,585 individuals and 2,873 organizations. Many of the organizations and individuals targeted by IRS were antiwar and "new left" groups and their leaders and members. There are also a number of files on "liberal establishment" organizations such as church groups. Clearly, these files were collected so IRS could provide "special" tax treatment to these individuals and organizations. Would it not now be proper to inform people that the tax audit they had several years ago was a result of the file kept by the Special Service Staff of IRS?

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated previously, the Rockefeller Commission recommends that files of the CHAOS project be destroyed after the completion of the current Congressional investigations into intelligence agencies. Senator FRANK CHURCH, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, has obtained agreement from the intelligence agencies that nothing will be destroyed until his committee has reported and gone out of business. That day will soon be here and the shredders may be warming up right now to destroy and bury forever the record of one of the sorriest chapters in American history. Accordingly, I am today requesting that all intelligence agencies refrain from destroying any files or records until such time as Congress has acted on the bill I am today introducing.

Finally, the bill I am introducing would eliminate the virtual blanket exemption which the Privacy Act now gives to the CIA. It is my view that no agency should be exempt from the operation of the Privacy Act, but that the CIA should be required to show serious damage to national defense or foreign policy before it may withhold an individual's file.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 12039

A bill to amend the Privacy Act of 1974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 552a of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (d) (2) (B) (i) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(i) correct, expunge, update, or supplement any portion thereof which the individual believes is not accurate, relevant, legally maintained, timely, or complete; or";

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (10) of subsection (e), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (11) of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by inserting immediately thereafter the following new paragraph:

"(12) inform each person who was—

"(A) the sender or receiver of any written communication, or communication by wire, cable, radio, or other means which was intercepted, recorded, or otherwise examined, by such agency, or any officer or employee thereof, without a search warrant, or without the consent of both the sender and receiver; or the occupant, resident, or owner of any premises or vehicle which was the subject of any search, physical intrusion, or other trespass, by such agency, or any officer or employee thereof, without a search warrant, or without the consent of such person;

"(B) the subject of a file or named in an index created, maintained, or disseminated by such agency, or any officer or employee thereof, in connection with an operation or program known as "CHAOS", which operation or program is described in the Report, dated June, 1975, to the President by the Commission on CIA Activities Within the United States;

"(C) the subject of a file or named in an index created, maintained, or disseminated by such agency, or any officer or employee thereof, in connection with an operation or program known as "Counterintelligence Program" or "COINTELPRO", which operation or program is described in the Statement of Hon. William B. Saxbe, and the hearings of Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on November 20, 1974;

"(D) the subject of a file or named in an index created, maintained, or disseminated by such agency, or any officer or employee thereof, in connection with an operation or program of the Internal Revenue Service known as "The Special Service Staff", which operation or program is described in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation Committee Print entitled "Investigation of the Special Service Staff of the Internal Revenue Service" dated June 5, 1975; that he, she, or it is or was such a person, provide each such person with a clear and concise statement of such person's rights under this section and section 552 of this title, and provide each such person with the option of requiring that agency to destroy each copy of such file or index in its possession.".

(3) by striking out "(e) (6), (7), (9), (10, and (11)" in subsection (j) and inserting in

lieu thereof "(e) (6), (7), (9), (10), (11), and (12)";

(4) by striking out paragraph (1) of such subsection; and

(5) by striking out paragraph (3) of subsection (k) and redesignating the folowing paragraphs accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. VANIK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SPECIAL ORDER INVESTIGATING THE LEAK OF THE HOUSE CIA REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to the serious issues raised by the passage of Mr. STRATTON's privileged resolution, which requires that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct investigate the leak of the House Intelligence Committee report.

I do not mean to sound overly pessimistic, but I am very much upset by the vote to sustain House Resolution 1042, and I feel that it is one that many respected Members of this House may come to regret.

I say this only after long moments of uncertainty and reflection. My decision to vote against this resolution was a difficult one, and I think that it is my duty to share the reasons for this decision with my constituents and my colleagues.

Much of my concern was aroused by the fact that the issue that we all faced last Thursday was not at all a clear-cut one. Unquestionably, a wrong-doing had occurred, and a majority decision of the House to withhold the publication of the committee report had been violated.

I do not choose to ignore this violation, or its origin, but I do dislike the solution that was put before this Congress and that was subsequently adopted after a single hour of floor debate.

Specifically, I question the method in which the House decided upon this investigation, the thrust of this investigation, as well as its potential consequences.

First of all, I very strongly support the responsible position voiced by the majority leader, Mr. O'NEILL. Indeed, Mr. STRATTON's resolution should have been referred to the Committee on Rules, and not brought directly to the floor in an atmosphere of emotional fervor.

If regular procedure had been followed, we would have had time to weigh in our own minds the best manner in which to conduct an investigation, and time to consider other reasonable alternatives, including Mr. PEYSER's resolution.

As it stands now, the Committee on Rules has been bypassed, and the House has dictated who will conduct the investigation and how.

Second, I am uncomfortable with the text of the resolution, which specifically mentions by name both Mr. Daniel Schorr and the Village Voice.

Frankly, I am worried that the focus of attention will prove to be the press, rather than the circumstances which resulted in the report being disclosed to the press without the assent of the members of the House.

I do not condone Mr. Schorr, but the issue of concern to the Congress is not who publicized the leaked material, or in what newspaper, but who instigated the leak in the first place.

This is an internal problem and it must be solved internally. Any party guilty of this breach of confidence should be held accountable for his or her acts. Clearly, some form of disciplinary action must be taken in order that the credibility of this House be fully restored.

The question, again, is how we go about this; and I am not sure that this particular resolution can accomplish these goals without serious repercussions.

I do not think that the manner in which the investigation is handled should result in obscuring the underlying issues that are involved here. The real issues remain the overclassification of a great many governmental documents, the second-class status of Congress in the eyes of the intelligence community, and the extent of the powers of this community.

If we become carried away with a single violation, we will be further contributing to the counterproductive backlash that is already taking place in the administration.

Sadly, the revelations of business and Government wrongdoings have not resulted in a decrease in the number of these wrong-doings. In fact, we are now being confronted with an increasing volume of executive and legislative proposals that actually broaden the powers of our largely unaccountable intelligence agencies.

I am not certain if, and how, we can turn this tide around. I am certain, however, that if we allow this action to follow its present course, we will see the civil liberties of the American public suffer a notable setback. There will be more Government secrecy rather than less, and less public accountability rather than more.

Thus, given this state of affairs, I feel that it is incumbent upon this Congress to restore a climate of moderation and fairness to a debate that has already become far too inflammatory.

It is precisely because I do not perceive the Stratton resolution as furthering such an effort that I cast my vote against it. I hope that, despite its passage, the House can succeed in reestablishing its own integrity and return to the business of restructuring our intelligence system in a constructive fashion.

SOVIET SPENDING ON ARMS UNDERESTIMATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article that appeared in yesterday's New York Times regarding revised estimates on military spending by the U.S.S.R.

For many years, it has been generally estimated that the Soviet were spending 6 to 8 percent of their gross national product on defense. In contrast, the United States has been spending 5.5 to 6 percent of its GNP for defense.

However, new investigations by the CIA and the Defense Intelligence Agency conclude that Soviet spending is probably much closer to 10 to 15 percent of GNP.

Soviet defense spending has been rising at a rate of about 3 percent per year, while concomitant spending by the United States has declined, with the exception of this year.

Thus, on a dollar basis, it has been concluded that the Soviet Union is outspending the United States on defense by a factor of 35 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion lately on the value of our détente policy with the Soviet Union. If détente is simply being used by the Soviets to buy time while they increase their military edge over the United States, then our policies should be carefully reexamined.

I believe it is unfortunate when legitimate questions concerning détente are raised by the Congress, the Secretary of State replies that such questions are destructive. The distinguished secretary implies that the only alternative to détente is cold war. Thus, he would have those of us in Congress who raise such questions to be placed in the role of warmongers and disturbers of the internation peace.

I suggest to my colleagues that an alternative stance is achieveable for American foreign policy—a stance that avoids the perils of détente at the one extreme and stark cold war on the other.

Prof. Warren G. Nutter of the University of Virginia, formerly Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, recently published an analysis of our détente policies. His analysis, prepared for the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research concludes that—

> Such a new foreign policy stance by the U.S. would involve the restoration of Western confidence and resolve, reconstituting deterrence, basing negotiation firmly on the principles of reciprocal concession and unimpaired security, and bargaining accordingly.

I share Professor Nutter's belief that détente has lulled this Nation into a state of complacency about the ultimate intentions of the Soviets. This relaxation mode in our foreign policy does not serve the best long-range interests of the United States. Some serious reevaluation needs to be conducted, and Congress should have an opportunity to make recommendations and express concerns about the direction of United States-U.S.S.R. relations without being maligned as diplomatic neanderthals by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the article from the New York Times on the Soviet arms buildup, together with another article that appeared in the February 23 issue of the